

6,580,916). Further, claims 3, and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weisshaar in view of Ben-Shachar (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,018). Given the outcome of the Examiner Interview, Applicant respectfully traverses both rejections as follows.

## **II. Claims 3-9**

For both the §102(e) rejection and the §103(a) rejection, the Examiner relies on Weisshaar for allegedly disclosing “a wireless server device connected to the network and implementing a master search service,” as recited in independent claims 3-5 and 7-8. In particular, the Examiner suggests that the implementation of a master search service can be found in Weisshaar’s specification at column 13, lines 57-59. Applicant respectfully disagrees and notes the Examiner’s agreement that “Weisshaar et al. does not specifically teach that the wireless server device comprises the master service search (or “service framework”), such that it would implement its own look-up function.” (See, Interview Summary Continuation Sheet, dated January 13, 2005).

The referenced portion of Weisshaar discloses a service framework which “provides a way for a service-using entity ... to look up a service.” (col. 13. lines 57-59). As specifically set out in the remainder of Weisshaar’s specification, this service framework, which implements a look-up function (service framework 235), resides on client platform 200 of user node 108. (See, Fig. 5 and col. 7, lines 17-24). On the other hand, Weisshaar’s specification fails to disclose any service framework residing on a server which also implements its own look-up function. Given the outcome of the January 13, 2005 Interview, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner agrees with this position.

Since Weisshaar does not disclose, in any manner, a wireless server device which implements a master search service, independent claim 4 is allowable. Additionally, because the Examiner relies on Weisshaar, in addition to Ben-Shachar, for the remaining rejection under § 103(a) of claims 3 and 5-9, and Ben-Shachar fails to supply this missing element, claims 3 and 5-9 also remain patentable in view of the asserted combination of Weisshaar and Ben-Shachar.

Applicant notes from the January 13, 2005 Interview Summary that the Examiner asserts that Weisshaar could still be used under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to reject the pending claims. However, Applicant respectfully submits that there is no disclosure, teaching or suggestion in Weisshaar to provide its server with a service search (or “service framework 235”) functionality which is specifically provided to Weisshaar’s client platform 200. Moreover, providing Weisshaar’s server with a service search functionality defeats the underlying purpose of the reference which is to allow the client platform 200 to perform service searches for services located on application servers. Therefore, Applicant respectfully suggests that Weisshaar cannot be applied under § 103(a) to reject the pending claims.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
U.S. Appln. No. 09/996,750

Q67505

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Eric P. Halber  
Registration No. 46,378

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 17 2005